



**Closeout Presentation
of the
Director's CD-2/3a Mini-Review
of the
MINERvA Project**

November 2, 2006

Answer to Charge Questions

1. Has MINERvA appropriately responded to the recommendations from the August, 2006 Director's CD-2/3a Review and have they suitably implemented the resulting corrective actions?
 - Yes. MINERvA has responded to the recommendations from August. They're implementing action or have solid reasons for not doing so in a few cases.

1 continued)

- Science 1-3 “Acceptable”
- 4,5&7 Acceptable
- 6 Acceptable
- 8 Note PM has established 3 interface coordinators
- 9-13 Not fully funding PMT purchases because not required to maintain schedule. FESB costs retained.

1 continued)

- 14-18 Acceptable
- 19-29 Acceptable except for obligation and funding profile reconciliation not yet being completed
- 30-33 Acceptable
- 34-41 Acceptable

Answer to Charge Questions

2. Is the cost and schedule baseline credible and supported by the Resource Loaded Schedule (RLS), the Bases of Estimate (BOE) and the project costing tool?
 - Getting there. (Not quite there yet. Must create needed obligation profile and show fits within Funding profile.) Have done a lot to clean-up the BOE. Did a good job in drill down. [Highest level TPC presentation could be a lot cleaner.]

2 continued

- MIE money in FY07 raises flag. See BTeV example on forward funding.
- Clarify the request for CD-3a approval (ie. long lead procurement's AND initial labor on these items)
- Do not show scheduled activities that have not yet begun. (An example “PMT lifting jig design” 923 was to have started in early October. 346, 347, 536-544, 550)
- Workload of new Deputy Project Manager? May need additional help here.

2 continued

- MIE money in FY07 raises flag. See BTeV example on forward funding.
- Clarify the request for CD-3a approval (ie. long lead procurement's AND initial labor on these items)
- “Desirable” to not have scheduled activities that have not yet begun. (An example “PMT lifting jig design” was to have started in early October.) May not be able to do anything about this.
- Workload of new Deputy Project Manager? May need additional help here.

Answer to Charge Questions

3. Has the cost and schedule baseline information been appropriately incorporated into the project documentation (e.g. Project Execution Plan (PEP), Acquisition Strategy (AS), and the Project Management Plan (PMP))?
 - YES. Baselines seem to be in these documents. Documentation looks pretty good. Maybe some editing needed yet (eg look carefully at PEP and PMP tables).
 - Several documents not formally approved or signed off on. (eg RMP, CMP, VMP)

Answer to Charge Questions

4. Is the MINERvA Project appropriately prepared for a DOE CD-1/2/3a Review?
 - Getting close. Quite a bit of “clean-up” required between now and Thanksgiving.

Assessment of MINERvA's “Scorecard”

- The combination of the written “scorecard” and the explanatory presentation was generally quite good.
- Maybe some details need to be cleaned up (eg Item 2 dates).
- Take adequate “credit” for internal design reviews. Maybe note how many you’ve done.
- Item 11 in the presentation ,Value Engineering description seemed to be Configuration Management
- Take credit for having started Monthly Reporting.

Summary

- MINERvA continues to do quite a good job in their serious approach to executing a project in the current DOE laboratory environment.
- This approach has bought a lot evidenced by DOE scheduling a single Mini-Review for CD-1/2/3a Critical Decisions.